

CIFT
MAR 13 1928

The

Chicago Theological Seminary

REGISTER



<i>The Church and Business Ethics</i>	- -	By EDGAR L. HEERMANCE
<i>The Perplexed Student</i>	- - - -	By CARL S. PATTON
<i>The Prayer Life of Jesus</i>	- -	By BENJAMIN W. ROBINSON
<i>Religion and Art</i>	- - - - -	By THE FACULTY
<i>A New Task for Theological Seminaries</i>		By GERALD BIRNEY SMITH
<i>The Minister Our Generation Needs</i>	- -	By FRED EASTMAN
<i>What Sort of Missionaries for China?</i>	- -	By PAUL REYNOLDS
<i>The Spiritual Community</i>	- - - -	By FREDERICK BRINK
<i>What the Students Are Doing</i>	- - -	By GREGORY VLASTOS
<i>Alumni Notes</i>	- - - - -	By FRANK G. WARD
<i>Book Reviews</i>	- - - - -	By THE FACULTY

The Chicago Theological Seminary

REGISTER

Volume XVIII

MARCH 1928

Number 2

Editorial Staff for the Register

FRED EASTMAN, *Editor*

ROBERT CASHMAN

OZORA S. DAVIS

ARTHUR E. HOLT

A. C. MCGIFFERT, JR.

CARL S. PATTON

BENJAMIN W. ROBINSON

MATTHEW SPINKA

MARGARET M. TAYLOR

FRANK GIBSON WARD

Published Four Times a Year, January, March, May, and November, by The Chicago Theological Seminary, 5757 University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of Congress August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, Authorized April 17, 1922.

The Chicago Theological Seminary REGISTER

Volume XVIII

MARCH 1928

Number 2

The Contribution of the Church to Business Ethics

By EDGAR L. HEERMANCE

(Author of "Chaos or Cosmos?" "The Unfolding Universe," "Codes of Ethics")

THE field chosen for this study is American business. Since the first decade of the twentieth century, a marked ethical movement has been going forward in a majority of the two thousand industries in the United States. The organized industry has developed certain positive standards of honor and fair play. A trained observer, interviewing a number of typical firms in the industry, and others with whom they have dealings, can form a fairly definite picture of what these standards are, what the trade as an organized group has come to feel is the thing to do or not to do. In many cases the attempt has been made to put their standards into writing. I have in my collection about three hundred documents of this sort. They often have a certain educational value. They may be taken as symbols or symptoms. But in general the codification of trade ethics has been done hastily and imperfectly. The important thing is the unwritten code, the gentlemen's agreement, which the written document can merely express and define. This has behind it the collective sentiment of the membership, the weight of conformity to custom which we find in any strong social group.

This ethical movement has affected

different industries in various degrees. In some cases it has come quietly, in others with an evangelistic fervor. It may have gone on slowly and unconsciously, through an accumulation of similar responses to similar situations. On the other hand, the ethics of the industry may have been welded in the white heat of discussion, as men faced the spread of practices by which the future of the group was being jeopardized.

Certain limitations of the movement should be noted. It has affected two types of business relations: First, the relations between competitors. In the organized trade association, business is carried on in an entirely different atmosphere. The old suspicion and hostility has broken down, with the growth of acquaintance. Competitors are working together for the promotion of certain common interests. Certain unfair practices of a business man toward his rivals are dropping out with the process of time, or as a result of collective action. Second, the relations of the business man to his customer. He is striving to make a safe profit, and in few cases, apart from a monopoly of some sort, is he making more than that. But he is developing an almost professional pride in his vocation, a sense of

business as a form of public service. (This is reflected in the Rotary and other service clubs. An outgrowth of the ethical movement in business, their idealism would have been impossible in the days of the hard-boiled slogan: "Business is business.") He is tending to take the long rather than the short view of immediate advantage. He tries to reduce prices so as to increase his volume. And his prices are open and the same to all comers. He aims to make satisfied customers. He strives for accuracy in his advertising and sales talks. If the goods are not all wool, he tells you so. He works to improve quality, appearance, sanitation. Such are the standards of the present-day business man toward the public, whether you take the department store or the corner grocer, the master-plumber or the undertaker, the canner or the machine-tool builder. If, as a customer, you fail to receive such treatment, you are likely to find that the offenders are outlaw firms, which have no standing in the organized industry. Either they are not members of their trade association at all, or they are members only in name, or the association itself is one in a backward state of development.

On the other hand, the ethical movement which I have been describing has not touched to any large extent the two important sides of business represented by financial promotion and employment. There is a tendency for important enterprises to be acquired by banking-houses, which develop them solely with a view to large profits from new capitalization. Building has been to a great extent in the hands of the speculative promoter. It is in this general field of investment that the business man has gone dollar mad. There are no recognized standards of practice, though there are signs that they are emerging.

In the field of labor relations, aside

from certain elementary standards such as sanitation and safety, the only ethics is of the paternalistic type. The average business man shows the war psychology brought out by his conflict with the labor unions and by the fear of radicalism. A great deal of experimenting is being done, both by employers and by labor unions. Valuable social data will in time accumulate. But the trade associations have kept out of the labor question, and rather wisely in my judgment.

This ethical advance, subject to the limitations we have noted, is a fact. Anyone who disputes it is merely displaying his ignorance. Of what Rauschenbusch described as the four un-Christianized aspects of the business world, two have been transformed within our generation. If his *Christianizing the Social Order* were written in 1927 instead of in 1912, the chapters on "The Law of Tooth and Nail" and "The Reign of the Middleman" would require a complete revision. How are we to account for this phenomenon? Two-fourths of the pagan social order have been Christianized, relatively speaking. What had the church to do with it?

It is clear that these ethical changes have not been carried out by the Christian church as an organization through any definite campaign or according to a formulated program. The movement has come from within business, rather than by impact from without. It has not been the result of preaching or of specific Christian teaching. Nor does it represent primarily a change of motive, but rather a development of social standards, from which new motives, more in line with the spirit of Christianity, may have emerged. Such contribution as the church has made to business morality has been indirect rather than direct.

Three general causes, or groups of causes, for the ethical movement in business can be assigned. The first may be de-

scribed as economic. The movement was due to the change from the loose methods of pioneer days to a closely knit economic structure, and to the growth of organization in the various industries. These trade associations, developing a strong social solidarity, became standard forming groups which tended to learn through experience certain fundamental principles of social relation. With these factors the church had nothing directly to do. They lay outside its sphere. We are dealing here, if you please, with economic determinism.

The second cause was the rise of higher standards of public morality in the general community. By the opening of the new century, what Beard calls the "accepted system of acquisition and enjoyment" had begun to break down. The movement which he describes as "social democracy" was well under way at the beginning of Roosevelt's second term in 1905. In fact, Roosevelt was in a sense its mouthpiece. People began to hold public officials and business corporations to a higher standard of accountability. This general ethical movement is coincident with the ethical movement in business, and the two are undoubtedly connected. To this change in community thought and action, the leaders of the newer social Christianity made a considerable contribution. But their influence on business was very indirect.

The third factor of which we must take account was personal leadership. One keeps coming on this in the history of every strong trade association. Many striking instances might be cited of far-seeing intelligence, coupled with devotion and moral stamina. And we must include the quality of the business groups from which leaders emerged and which made their influence possible. The intellectual level of these business groups has been rising rather steadily. But it requires more than intelligence to take the long

rather than the short view. And for competitors to form a successful common organization involves responsible human material. Without this high personal quality, there could have been no ethical movement in American business. It is in this direction, if anywhere, that we should look for the contribution of the Christian church.

Let us first lay down our time scale. The men responsible for the ethical movement in the trade associations, and in many of the stronger corporations, between 1905 and the present, assuming an average age of forty-five years, were born between 1860 and 1882, and received their moral training in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. If church influence was operative, it would have been chiefly during that formative period.

Was it operative? The question would repay detailed study by a competent sociologist. I have only three lines of evidence to offer. The first is the general impression that the leaders in the movement, as I have come to know them, have in a large number of cases been active Christian men. This is confirmed by the published biographies of men prominent in business. With few exceptions, they have been church members. Miss Tarbell's life of Elbert H. Gary traces this influence in detail in the case of the United States Steel Corporation and the steel industry in general. The example of Gary may be exceptional. But we have the further general evidence that the rural and small-town communities, from which most of our business leaders have come, were strongly dominated by the church during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. I believe we are justified in drawing this conclusion: we owe to the impact of Christian ideas those factors which impress one in the ethical movement as a whole: the habit of moral integrity, the sense of moral values and distinctions

in business, an idealistic rather than a coldly materialistic type of thinking, and a distinctively religious motivation or sanction behind the standards of practice evolved. Without this factor the movement, as we have it, would not have occurred. The typical American business man is a product of the Christian church, particularly of the evangelical Protestant branch. As thus produced, he has, under favorable circumstances, in turn worked out the details of this ethical revolution, or series of revolutions.

It may be objected that, as similar church influences had been surrounding the business man in this country for two hundred and fifty years, an ethical movement in business should have appeared earlier. The answer is that ethical standards such as we have been considering are group standards. Up to about the beginning of the present century, there were practically no social groups in American business. We were still living under pioneer conditions, where it was each man for himself. In many individual firms and corporations, such as the early fire insurance companies of Connecticut, the effect of Christian training was very marked. The Puritan in every country has tended to prosper as a business man. But, apart from organization, the ethical pace is likely to be set by those who are the least scrupulous. In such an environment, which was characteristic of the pre-organization era, particularly after the industrial revolution, the influence of early Christian training was dissipated, or survived only in sheltered bays of the business man's life.

From this study, if it can be dignified by that name, I draw the following tentative conclusions:

1. Standards of business practice, like all group standards, depend to a large extent on the training received in the previous generation.

2. The contribution of the church in the present instance has been in the form of character-building, and to a less degree in the inculcation of the religious attitude and of specific religious ideas.

3. The function of the church, in collaboration with other educational agencies, is so to shape the thought and action habits of the next generation that detailed standards may be devolved and given religious sanction.

4. The church has also served as a conserving agency. While many individual business men have kept in active touch with the church, this further influence is even more difficult to appraise. In many cases the chief effect of the trade associations has been emancipation. By contrast with a generation ago, the Christian business man has been made free to follow general standards of integrity and fair play already operative in his life.

5. While these functions are carried out by the local churches as organized groups, the work of the church in the actual development of business standards is done not as an organization but as individuals. Those trained under its influence become a creative element in the business group, and in the general community whose standards of life react on the business group. Business ethics is distinctly compartmental in character, and probably the same is true of ethics as a whole.

6. The further standardization of ethics, in the extremely complex fields of finance and employment, requires widespread experimentation by individuals, corporations, and trade groups, capable of learning from experience and integrating conflicting interests. How rapidly and effectively this process will go forward depends to a large extent on whether, during the present generation, the organized church—and Roman Catholic and Hebrew elements must now be given more

consideration in the reckoning—has continued to fulfil its function in the life of the community.

In conclusion, let me offer an *obiter dictum*. The church might well be given a more direct function in forming and enforcing ethical standards. I am inclined to feel that this is made necessary by the very complexity of the problems involved in finance and employment and their wide ramification in community life. In certain directions, business ethics has already outrun community ethics. It is doubtful whether even the indirect influence of the church will continue as it has been, unless we meet Tawney's challenge and bridge the unfortunate gulf which has grown up between religious and secular. Our problem is educational in the widest sense. Religion, I am inclined to believe, is an essential element in civilization. Those trained under church influence should be in a position to apply religious tests and sanctions to new business situations, as they affect the group and the community. That is, Christian ideas should operate consciously, and not merely as an unconscious influence. The

church failed in this regard at two great crises: first, in the sixteenth century, at the beginning of the commercial era; second, in the nineteenth, at the beginning of the industrial era. In each case the consequences of this failure were socially tragic. Attempts have been made repeatedly—by the medieval church, by Calvinism at Geneva and in New England, and by modern reformers—to impose on business a ready-made system of ethics. These attempts were too amateur to have practical value. Their dogmatic form and utopian substance called out defense reactions in the business world which retarded the course of normal ethical development. The imperative need is a restatement of Christian ethics in terms of our broader horizons and our more complex society. It must be pragmatic rather than dogmatic, social rather than individualistic. I venture to suggest that the key to such a restatement is the Kingdom or Dominion of God, as the present moral environment of the race, to which all social relations and institutions must adjust themselves if they are to be normal to the universe.

The Perplexed Student

By CARL S. PATTON

"As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be."

IT COMES to my notice now and then that students in the Seminary are in trouble because of the things they are learning in their classes. Old beliefs seem to be in danger. New beliefs have not yet emerged or do not yet promise to take the place of the old.

It is sometimes assumed that this is a new state of affairs, due perhaps to peculiar circumstances of theological thought at the present time, or attributable to the

methods or spirit of particular instructors. As an indication that such is not the case I may instance some recollections of my own theological education which dates back thirty-five years.

When I went to Andover in 1890 there was much theological unrest in the air. Andover had been founded to teach a particular type of theology, and in 1890 the question had been up for several years as to whether the professors were fulfilling

the requirements of the foundation. The trial of Professor Egbert Smythe was still in progress during my entering year. The troubles which were gathering about the professors and the consequent suspicion into which the Seminary had been brought led all the instructors, as it now seems to me, to be scrupulously careful to avoid giving offense whenever possible. To cause trouble for any of us, which would cause more trouble for them, was certainly far from their intention. In addition to this they doubtless had the natural feeling of all theological instructors that the students would find trouble enough for themselves without the professor's injecting any if he can avoid it.

And yet the sources of trouble were near and active. They were mostly in three departments. The first was that of the Old Testament. Professor Briggs was or had recently been on trial at Union. Professor Mitchell was coming under suspicion at Boston. Professor Henry Preserved Smith was among the prophets without honor in his own institution. Benjamin Bacon, then working in Old Testament, had published his *Genesis of Genesis* and *The Triple Tradition of the Exodus*. George Adam Smith had lectured in this country. All these men, though most of them mildly and irenically, had brought to public attention the questions of the higher criticism. Their positions, now long established, look to us very harmless and quite necessary. But thirty-five years ago they were at the center of the storm.

Our Old Testament professor was George F. Moore. His method was to proceed with what he had to say without reference to any controversy that was going on, and apparently without any suspicion that anybody could object to it. And, as I remember, nobody in his classes did. Perhaps it had filtered into the minds of some of us, even then, that there was no

intimate connection between the Christian religion and the historicity of Abraham. But more than that, Professor Moore's command of his subject was so manifest, and our own ignorance was so profound, that there was no point at which any student could get hold to register any objection. Besides, his manner of teaching was such as to make his students feel at once that the scientific point of view was the only sensible or even possible one from which to approach the subject. What he said was certainly new to all of us. Probably there were few if any of us to whom it was not thoroughly revolutionary. But nobody seemed to worry much about it. I don't remember anyone who was in real trouble over it. It seemed so inevitable that you couldn't quarrel with it.

A point of more real trouble was the New Testament. Here everything was done to protect us. Professor Ryder was a good New Testament scholar, and his positions were certainly much in advance of those of his students. But his interest was largely in the detailed exposition of the text. There was not much inquiry in his classes as to the origin, either of the gospels or of the new religious movement they represented. I do not remember, for instance, that the question of the influence of the mystery religions upon Christianity was raised in his classes. The synoptic problem was not probed with any thoroughness. Some inkling of the difference between the synoptics and the Fourth Gospel we did get from him, but the matter was not radically treated. My impression is that at that time at least he accepted the traditional opinion of the authorship of that gospel. We certainly did not get from him the idea that the value of the gospel is not as a source of information about the teachings of Jesus but as an index of the growing and changing thought of early Christendom. I do

not remember that he ever discussed the question of the Virgin birth, though he may have done so in a way not to attract my attention. If he distinguished between the view of the Resurrection represented in the gospels and that apparently entertained by the apostle Paul it was not done in a way to disturb any of us. For all these questions were largely outside of his interest. He represented the older type of New Testament teacher whose main concern was to explain the text. Even if he had raised some controversial questions, he had a homiletic habit and a sincere and manifest piety that would have gone far to disarm anything he had said. One thing he unconsciously did to keep us out of trouble: being a learned and truly liberal man, and at the same time a devoutly spiritual one, he gave us the very valuable impression that we could learn as much as we would and be pious still.

Professor Hincks taught "New Testament Theology" and gave a course of lectures on "The Life of Christ." He was a careful, painstaking scholar, conservative in temperament, but welcoming questions or objections and dealing fairly with them, and always ready to move to new positions with new light. I do not remember that his lectures on "New Testament Theology" got us into any great trouble. That may have been because the Pauline theology already had so tenuous a hold upon most of us that we were not disturbed at its being a little further loosened. In his course on "The Life of Christ" Professor Hincks did not shrink from comparison and criticism of the gospels. But the criticism, as I now remember, concerned itself chiefly with minor points. I do not recall that he ever raised any question as to the historicity of the miraculous elements in the gospel story, though I may be mistaken there. But his teaching, at least, was not such as to raise any doubts on such matters.

The lives of Christ to which he referred us were, of course, those current at that time. And the purpose and effect of the entire course were to give one a picture of the life of Jesus as consistent as possible, and with small difficulties ironed out, but not to raise any fundamental questions.

Professor Harris, in theology, was also a liberal man, but his method was largely historical and not in the least dogmatic. He was progressive but far from radical. He assumed the doctrine of evolution, which in itself was revolutionary for most of his hearers. But the philosophical discussions that have made such inroads upon theology since his time had not begun, or at all events had not invaded the theological schools. Pragmatism, Pluralism, Humanism, Neo- and Critical-Realism, Instrumentalism, Mechanicism, were not yet in the field. William James was still only a psychologist, and the philosophical revolutionists of a later day had not yet begun to write. Our only contact with philosophy in Professor Harris' classes were a few veiled references to Kant and Hegel not intended to be understood, and the advice to read Royce's *Spirit of Modern Philosophy*, then just out. We were also advised to read Green's *Prolegomena*, though I don't think anyone did, at least until long afterward. There was an occasional reference to Spencer's *Synthetic Philosophy*. The argument about miracles consisted in exposing Hume. Philosophy made no trouble for us in those days. It was still the handmaid of religion; and if in any instance it was not, you might take it for granted that it was wrong.

One other beloved teacher labored to keep us clear of difficulty: Professor Egbert Smythe lectured for a year, four or five days a week, on "Church History." He spent most of his time on the Alogi and kindred brethren, and seldom got far beyond the Council of Nicea, as the total purpose of his course was to impress upon

the student that the evolution of Trinitarianism was a divinely guided movement. If you did not come out of his course a good Trinitarian, you at least came out with the feeling that you ought to be.

The men who gave these courses were good men—as good, on the whole, as could be found anywhere at the time. They were all liberal men. But with the exception of Professor Moore, they were not radical thinkers, not pushing thinkers, and the circumstances of the Seminary had made them cautious.

It may seem strange, therefore, that such courses as they gave should afford many grounds for offense. But they surely did. In regard to the Old Testament, as I have said, not much mental anguish seemed to be produced; or at least nobody had the hardihood to cry out. But the courses in theology, mild as they now seem, did cut men loose from their old moorings. I think what happened, though it was not specifically stated nor realized at the time, was that we were thrown back upon our own responsibility in matters of religious belief. The question of authority in religion was nowhere drastically treated. It was never said, "There is no authority in religion other than is to be found in philosophy or science; the only authority is in every man's own soul." On the contrary, it was said that the Christian consciousness was an authority. But that did not help much. Anyhow the Bible was no such authority as many of us had supposed; and when the question came up to any one of us, "Shall I believe this or that?" an appeal to the "Christian consciousness" only complicated the matter, since it was the man himself who had to make the appeal and interpret the answer. The course in theology gave each one of us the impression that he was afloat and must steer for himself. And that in

itself, when it first comes to one, is not a particularly quieting thought.

In the New Testament courses the trouble seemed to center mostly about Jesus. If Paul was found not to agree at all points with the rest of us, most of us felt that we might get along without his approval. But about Jesus we did not feel so. Even here we were not pushed very far, whether because of the caution of the professors or because their own positions were only a little way advanced from the orthodox. I think most of the students accepted the statement of Professor Hincks that a person so unique as Jesus would be expected to work miracles such as no one else had ever worked. We were left to ourselves to discover that this argument traveled in a circle. Most of us did not find that out until afterward, and the professor himself followed the reasoning apparently without misgiving. But if no questions were raised about the Virgin birth it was evident that nothing was built upon it, and this in itself was disquieting. The eschatological teachings of Jesus were easily disposed of, by saying that the disciples had remembered incorrectly, and no intimation was given that Jesus himself might have been mistaken about the end of the age. But in spite of all these easements there were plenty of things to be disturbed about. For one thing, the prophets had not, as we had supposed, foreseen the events of the life of Jesus; it had been no part of their business to write history five hundred years before it happened. That seemed to break the spiritual connection between the Old Testament and the New, and to remove one of the ancient landmarks. The value of the predictive element in Jesus' own teaching was likewise jeopardized. The roots of all this predictive business, of course, ran back into the idea of the supernatural in which we had all been brought up. How much this

meant to the average student of that time may be indicated by a question one of them asked while Professor Ryder was discussing the predictions of Jesus in regard to Peter's denial. Professor Ryder had argued that Jesus might have foreseen this denial from what he knew of Peter and the circumstances—there might, therefore, have been nothing supernatural about it. Then one fellow asked, "But what about his saying that it would happen just before the crowing of the cock?" Professor Ryder looked sorrowfully at him, and said, "Oh now, don't bring in the rooster." There was also the matter of demoniacal possession. Most of the students convinced themselves that Jesus did not believe in it, but accommodated himself to the ideas of the time. But others could not be satisfied with that, or could see no reason to accept it, and were therefore convinced that on one item which seemed to have a clear bearing upon the spiritual life, Jesus had been mistaken. And if about this, why not about almost anything?

Though I cannot now lay my hand on many specific questions of this sort that gave us trouble, it must be remembered that all these things are relative. An idea is disquieting to you not as it deviates from some norm of absolute truth, but as it differs from something you have so far believed. The accumulation of many small details, in which you find you have been mistaken, leaves you with the feeling that you may be mistaken about almost anything. And the great disturbance comes not from one detail nor from many but from the discovery that you are in an intellectual atmosphere, and that all religious questions are being approached from a point of view which is somehow radically different from your own. You are left alone to find your way in a strange land where nothing looks familiar.

I am not sure, therefore, but the teach-

ing at Andover in my day, mild as it now seems, was quite as disquieting as that given in any theological school of our time. And the commotion was great. Different men, of course, had different ways of protecting themselves against the doubts that arose. A few did not understand, and so were not distressed. A few did not care, just because ideas as such did not interest them. They were able to shift the emphasis from the intellectual to the spiritual, as if that were quite independent of and untouched by anything you might think—and so they were not troubled. Two or three of our men were confirmed Hegelians, and so long as they were not robbed of their thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, they did not miss anything else that was gone. Others, of whom I had the good fortune to be one, had somehow got hold of the conviction that it was good to hear anything that could be said for or against any matter before you made up your mind about it, and that it must always be spiritually profitable to find out the truth, whatever that might prove to be. But those who had lacked any of the easements were quite bereft. I should be greatly surprised to find that there is any more earnest questioning or any deeper perplexity anywhere these days than was felt at Andover in my time.

As to the results of all this, I do not see that there were any bad results. A few men in my class did make up their minds that they could never preach, because they wouldn't have anything to preach. This was generally along toward the end of the first year. In spite of it they all went boldly along to the end, the recovery in each case being complete, as I remember. If some of them did later find that they could not preach, this discovery had nothing to do with what they had learned, nor with any struggles they had undergone, in the theological school. As to the process by which we pulled through,

we did it by ourselves. I don't remember that the professors helped us any. They certainly didn't offer to, and we didn't ask them. We had the feeling that they had got us into our trouble, and we were afraid that if we went to them in it we should only get in deeper. A group of us did go down one evening by appointment to Professor Moore's house, and he talked to us for an hour. An illuminating hour it was, too. But Professor Moore was so far ahead of us in historical and philosophical knowledge, and so many things were clear to him that were not clear to the rest of us, and an hour is so short a time in which to clear up difficulties that have been accumulating for a couple of years that we were helped but not rescued. He kept us afloat, if I may so say, but he did not pull us out.

For the most part it was not a thing to be helped from the outside. Personally I should have been much embarrassed to be offered help in my difficulties by any of the professors and quite as much so to have sought it from them. We didn't want comfort; and as for any urge to push on through our difficulties we had plenty of that in ourselves. Moreover, we seemed to understand one another better than anyone else understood us. When a man is finding his way he will often get more encouragement from those who are wandering with him than from anybody else.

If the trouble is in his own mind it has to be worked out in his own mind. So we comforted ourselves, and we corrected and rebuked and disciplined one another and we came out all right. And afterward it looked to all of us as if all this had been an unavoidable and a necessary part of our theological training, perhaps on the whole one of the most valuable parts of it, the avoidance of which, if it had been possible, would have robbed each one of us of a precious item in his experience.

If I may therefore tack a moral on to this, I have just said it. This process of spiritual churning-up is inevitable, and has always taken place wherever men were sincerely trying to learn. Neither student nor instructor need take it too seriously. It need not, indeed, be accentuated unnecessarily by the instructor. He need not take delight in the trouble he makes. Irritation is not his only function. He should be human, and remember the hole of the pit from which he himself was once digged. But if he is an honest instructor, and knows anything his pupils do not know, one by-product of his work will always be this mental unrest of those who are learning under him. And as for the student, the only really dreadful thing for him would be that he should not learn anything. If he can learn something, a little temporary unrest should look to him, as it truly is, a small price to pay for it.

The Prayer Life of Jesus

By BENJAMIN W. ROBINSON

I. PRAYER IN A WORLD OF SCIENCE

WITH the advance of modern civilization, all thoughtful leaders are agreed that one of the greatest dangers to the individual lurks in the tendency toward a mechanical and routine existence. A man becomes a part of a great business into which he fits himself, he performs his appointed task during the day, he eats the foods which are set in front of him, he often spends his evenings in whatever commercialized amusements confront him most persuasively.

Individual character and personality are the hope of the human race. Without these there can be no real progress. The ultimate brotherhood of man and the perfected society are but idle dreams unless individual consciences are awakened and great souls are developed.

This ideal of progress in personal character can be attained only by a definite effort on the part of each individual to detach himself repeatedly from the machinery of his daily duties. He must form the habit of spending a portion of his time in thoughtful consideration of his own place and worth in the universe.

If he has no vital knowledge of God, he will spend this time of detachment in analyzing his own mind and confronting his own thoughts and ideals of service and happiness. If his God is evolution, he will devote himself for a while each day to contemplating the accomplishments of humanity from the time of its first animal-like existence to its culmination in the scientific discoveries and social attainments of the present. If his God is nature, he will think of the mountain tops, or his soul will travel among the stars in the vastness of the universe. If to him God is

a spirit who comes very close to human hearts, the hour of communion will search after that spirit which has lighted the souls of great men in every age. If he is a Christian in thought as well as name, he will find this spirit supremely revealed in the personality of Jesus.

"Religion is inner life," says Deissmann (*The Religion of Jesus*, p. 43). "It brings forth a rich life . . . it enriches culture . . . it is a living and moving in God . . . it is always a communion of man with his God." Without such communion our civilization and culture must become a mere mechanism which will soon stop for lack of fuel and power. Such an idea of prayer not only belongs in a world of science; it is an indispensable part of it.

When a man communes, he naturally expresses to himself those elements of character which are a part of his ideal, and which are lacking or imperfect in his own life. His prayer sometimes takes the form of a petition: "Give me more patience" or "Help me to be of greater service." It is important to notice that such petitions are not superstitious appeals for personal comfort, but are attempts of the soul to attain a higher life through communion with God.

It is this fact that prayer often takes the form of petition, which has led to much misunderstanding of its true character and value in modern life. But such misunderstandings are rapidly clearing away. There is no longer any place for doubt that prayer rightly understood is a fundamental essential of character and progress.

Jesus once said, "When you pray, go in to your own room and shut the door" (Matt. 6:6). One man in Chicago puts

this into practice frequently by going into the busiest railroad station in the heart of Chicago, and while he waits for his train to take him to his suburban home, he finds a corner in the waiting-room and puts a newspaper in front of him. The newspaper makes a very good door, and the man finds a new power in a few minutes of fellowship with Jesus, and through Jesus, with God.

In a recent classroom discussion, one student defined prayer as "a charging of the battery of the soul through contact with the infinite God." This figure has in it much of truth, but the class put it in second place when another student contributed his definition: "Prayer," he said, "is a tuning-in of the radio of the soul, to catch the music and message of God."

2. JESUS' PERSONAL PRAYERS

Early in the morning, before daylight, Jesús got up and went out and found a lonely spot and prayed there [Mark 1:35].

Great crowds came together to listen to him; . . . but he himself used to retire to lonely places to pray [Luke 5:16].

The Rabbis and Pharisees became angry and excited; they began discussing what they could do to Jesus. It was then that he went up in the mountain to pray and to spend the whole night in prayer with God [Luke 6:11, 12].

Jesus went up in the mountain to pray, taking Peter, John and James with him. While he was praying the appearance of his face became quite different and his clothing took on a dazzling whiteness. . . . Peter and his companions had been over-powered by sleep and they awoke and saw his glorious appearance [Luke 9:28, 29, 32].

Then Jesus called with a loud voice, Father into thy hands I entrust my spirit [Ps. 31:5, Luke 23:46].

Prayer was an essential part of the Jewish religion of Jesus' day. Jesus learned to pray from his earliest years. In the first chapter of Mark is the statement that Jesus, rising long before daylight, found a lonely spot and prayed there. It would seem to have been a custom which he frequently followed. Often in that mountainous country, he climbed up nearer

heaven to spend a while talking to his God (Mark 6:46). On some occasions he spent the whole night in prayer (Luke 6:12).

The story of the transfiguration is full of suggestion regarding the effect of prayer upon Jesus. As we read Mark's account, we can almost hear Peter narrating to his early Christian audiences the remarkable occurrence: While he was praying the appearance of his face changed, it took on a heavenly grandeur, his very clothing seemed to be whiter than usual.

Luke has preserved for us more records of the prayers of Jesus than has Matthew or Mark. From the beginning of the ministry to the end, he tells us of the rich prayer life of Jesus. It was while he was praying at the time of his baptism that he saw the heavens open and heard the voice of God and received his spirit. At the time of the feeding of the multitude, he looked up to heaven and gave thanks. When the crowds gathered, he gave them what might be called a sermon. But after the talk, his custom was to retire to a lonely place to commune with his heavenly Father (Luke 5:16).

At every decisive turning-point in his career, he took time for prayer. When the question confronted him in regard to messiahship—"Who do people say that I am?"—he was found praying with his disciples (Luke 9:18). How anxious must have been Jesus' thought for the seventy-two when he sent them out to try their hand at preaching and healing! How full of joy was his prayer upon their return, "I thank thee, O Father!" (Luke 10:21). How earnest was his prayer for Simon—would Satan win him or would Simon become the chief apostle (Luke 22:31)?

The prayers of the last hours take us to the darkest depths of Jesus' agony and show us the sublime quality of his heroism. Mark has preserved the original

Aramaic word for "Father," in Jesus' prayers. It is probably the most expressive single word in the Bible. Peter must have heard Jesus say "Abba" with such remarkable depth and feeling and tone that Peter himself learned how to repeat the word to others with something of the religious meaning which Jesus gave. Mark heard Peter use the word and has passed it on to all succeeding generations of Christians. Jesus' prayer to his Father, in Gethsemane, is not one in which he seeks to escape the Father's will, but one in which he seeks to know that will and bring himself into harmony with it.

The prayers upon the cross are the final revelation of his closeness to God and of his victory over suffering and death: "My God, My God, Why hast thou forsaken me?" As Deissmann has well said, Jesus did not create the words of this prayer. It is a quotation from a familiar Psalm. Nevertheless it shows that Jesus addressed God even in a time when it seemed as though God had forsaken him. The prayer is not even a petition. "This prayer, with its elementary burden of need, accomplishes more than a hundred comfortable theses against the reasonableness of prayer. This prayer teaches prayer . . . it teaches that communion with God signifies a struggle for God—a struggle between God-nearness and God-forsakenness" (*Religion of Jesus*, p. 62).

In this fierce struggle, Jesus emerged victor. His victory is voiced in his final prayer, "Father, into thy hands I entrust my spirit."

The beauty and power of the prayer life can be learned through fellowship with Jesus. In prayer, Jesus communes with his God, as a child talks with his father. The prayer may have any attitude which the child has toward his father. It may be a quiet petition, a passionate supplication, a shout of joy, or a cry of pain. Prayer is for Jesus a holy and per-

sonal matter. The world is not permitted to listen to it. There is nothing magical about it. It is a marvelous, powerful remedy. It heals the sick soul, it gives patience and courage, it inspires with insight and vision, it gives victory and beauty of life.

3. JESUS' TEACHING REGARDING PRAYER

When you pray, do not imitate the hypocrites who like to pray standing in the synagogues and in public places, for others to see them. I assure you that is the only reward they will obtain. When you pray, go into your own room and shut the door and pray to your Father quietly, and your Father who sees what is within, will recompense you.

When you pray, do not use the same empty phrases over and over, as many peoples do who imagine that they get a hearing by using many words. Do not be like them, for your God, who is your Father, knows what you need before you ask him [Matt. 6:5-8].

If you, bad as you are, know enough to give good things to your children, how much more surely will your Father above give the holy spirit to those who ask him [Luke 11:9-13].

A Jewish synagogue service in Jesus' day included many specified prayers; at least eighteen definitely formulated prayers are known which were used in the ordinary services. Jesus warns his disciples against too many set prayers. It is probable that in the saying of Matt. 6:7 Jesus had in mind not only the "Gentiles" (American Standard Version) but also those Jews who memorized set prayers and wore them upon their foreheads and who took pride in their ability to repeat these prayers in the Temple or elsewhere.

Jesus directs his disciples to avoid all publicity in their own personal prayers. It is the one who strives to express his own soul and his own personal needs, especially the one who in agony of spirit seeks to bring his own soul into harmony with the Eternal and the Infinite, who always receives his recompense from the Father.

Moreover, God knows us better than

we know ourselves. The father knows what the child needs, even before he asks. "God does not need our prayers. This is a warning, not against the prayer of petition, but against the unchildlike, stubborn prayer, against the prayer of petition that is thought of as compelling magic" (Deissmann, *op. cit.*, p. 65).

The parables of the Friend at Midnight (Luke 11:5-8) and of the Importunate Widow (Luke 18:1-5) emphasize Jesus' teaching that it is not the single isolated prayer but the constant persistence in prayer which always brings results.

"Ask and your prayer will be granted" (Luke 11:9). The absoluteness of the statement should not disturb the modern reader, for Jesus was looking for a statement radical enough to compel his followers to think deeply and search their own hearts. Jesus says that no prayer can go unheard and unanswered, but it is always the Father's will which we should seek to know. One who does not ask at all naturally does not receive, and one who stands in front of a door without knocking is not likely to have the door opened to him. But remember, Jesus continues, that your heavenly Father knows how to give good things to his children (Luke 11:13).

4. THE LORD'S PRAYER

Luke has a habit of following his literary sources rather closely, and we may conclude with considerable certainty that the earlier record of the Lord's Prayer read approximately as in Luke 11:2-4:

Father, may thy name be revered,
May thy kingdom come,
Give us the bread that is needful for the day,
Forgive us our sins
For we also forgive anyone who wrongs us,
And do not bring us into temptation.

"Father" was often used by the Jews in their prayers, but Jesus made of it a new word. "Father" in the Old Testament

means "creator." "Father" for Jesus means such a father as is pictured in the parable of the Prodigal Son, the one who while his child is still a long way off runs to welcome and to embrace, the one who knows how to give good gifts to his children (Luke 11:13).

It takes a distinct effort to hold this warmth of relationship in mind as the prayer passes to the second thought, "May thy name be revered." This is, of course, not a petition that God's name should not be lightly used in profanity or idle speech. As a study of Old Testament and Jewish usage at once reveals, "name" means "character." It would not be far wrong to translate, "May thy name of Father, and our relation as sons and brothers, be held more sacred than everything else in life."

"May thy Kingdom come." Again it is no asking of any personal blessing which is the content of this prayer. The prayer for the coming of the kingdom was a common Jewish utterance in synagogue worship: "May he establish his kingdom during your life." But Jesus changed the whole meaning of the old words when he said, "The kingdom comes not with observation: the kingdom is within you." "Kingdom" means "rule" or "supremacy" in the spiritual sense. A modern translation might read, "May the supremacy of love be established in my heart and in the world at large." The petition thus follows naturally the preceding "May thy name be revered." The purpose is to bring the heart of the one who prays into touch with that great unbounded Power which is causing brotherhood to triumph in individual souls and so in the world at large.

"Give us our needful bread for the day." This sounds at first like a personal petition. But both Jewish usage and the teaching of Jesus show that its real meaning is to be found in the Old Testament

passage from which it is in substance a quotation:

Give me neither poverty nor riches;
Feed me with the food that is needful for me;
Lest I be full, and deny thee, and say, Who
is Jehovah?
Or lest I be poor, and steal, and use profanely
the name of my God [Prov. 30:8, 9].

The purpose of this petition of the Master's prayer is to free the soul from anxiety for material things, that neither want nor plenty may interfere with the actual practice of the presence of the Kingdom and the rule of love.

"Forgive us our sins, for we also forgive anyone who wrongs us." This is the only part of the prayer which is not paralleled in Jewish prayers. Forgiveness of others was a new thing to be included in a talk with God. The petition recalls two basic principles in Jesus' religion: (1) Jesus' idea of sin is concerned more with omission than commission. In the scene of the Great Judgment, the Judge says to those on his left: "I was thirsty and you gave me no drink—I was sick and you did not visit me." The petition is a plea to God to remove any stain of selfishness. (2) The other principle involved is that of brotherliness. The forgiveness of others is a section to be built into the edifice of the Kingdom. In bring-

ing this thought into the prayer, the one who is offering his soul to God transfers himself to that realm. He lives the perfected life now—"for we forgive anyone who wrongs us." It is part and parcel of Jesus' teaching that we may here and now live the life of the ideal brotherhood which by some men is being postponed to the future.

"Do not bring us into temptation." In the dramatic scenes of the Book of Job, God allows Satan to tempt and try Job. But according to James 1:13, "No one should think when he is tempted that his temptation comes from God, for God . . . never tempts anyone. When a man is tempted it is by his own desire that he is lured." The purpose of the petition is to strengthen our confidence that it is not God who torments us in a time of moral conflict in our souls, that he rather stands ready to help on the side of the nobler and purer life.

A human being in the midst of the vastness of the material universe and the limitless earthly possibilities of shipwreck can, through the medium of persistent prayer, keep in vital touch with that unseen reality which is emancipating from what is lower and creating and re-creating the higher and finer forms of life and character.

Religion and Art

I. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

ON FEBRUARY 2 the faculties of the Seminary and the Divinity School, in joint session, adopted the report of their Committee on Religion and Art, recommending important additions to the theological curriculum. The most significant of the recommendations are the following:

I. That our respective institutions recognize that they have a definite responsibility to develop more adequately the imaginative, aesthetic, and creative life of our students, and that courses in the field of religion and art are desirable to this end.

II. That the pertinent courses in the field of religion and art be brought together in the *Catalogue* under a heading to be determined, such as "Religion and Art"; this to be one of the sections under the major heading, "Practical Theology."

III. That existing courses be supplemented by such additional courses in this field as may seem desirable.

IV. That the following outline of courses be made the tentative basis of our development in this field of religion and art:

1. Music

- a) Ministry of Music
- b) Graded Music for the Church School
- c) Hymnology
- d) Voice Culture
- e) Theory and Technique of Church Music
- f) Choral Music

2. Drama

- a) Study and Analysis of Great Dramas
- b) The Writing of Religious Dramas and Pageants
- c) Theory and Technique of Dramatic Production

3. Biography

4. Poetry and the Literature of Power

5. Journalism

6. Christian Worship

7. Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture

- a) History of Christian Art
- b) Use of Art in Religious Education
- c) Architecture

V. That a full-time instructor in music should be engaged, who shall be expected to organize the work in music in such a way that the courses should receive credit. If it should appear that the election of music by the students is not sufficient to demand the entire time of an instructor, the Committee feels that it may be possible to find or to train a young man who can handle both the work in music and the work in art, as outlined in paragraph 7, section IV, above.

The Committee which presented this report was constituted as follows:

FOR THE DIVINITY SCHOOL

Charles W. Gilkey
Donald W. Riddle
Gerald Birney Smith
Theodore G. Soares
Harold R. Willoughby

FOR THE SEMINARY

Fred Eastman
Anton T. Boisen
Arthur E. Holt
Carl S. Patton
Wilhelm Pauck

In the discussion, the question was raised whether such matters as worship, biography, journalism, public speaking, and the history of Christian art should be listed under "Religion and Art" or elsewhere in the school catalogues. A committee was appointed to make further report on this matter.

Most of the members of the two facul-

ties spoke in favor of the recommendations. Limitations of space prevent recording here more than two of the addresses—those by Dr. Gerald Birney Smith and Dr. Fred Eastman—but they are representative.

II. A NEW TASK FOR THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

By GERALD BIRNEY SMITH

IT IS the duty of a theological seminary not only to prepare ministers for churches as they exist but to furnish ideals which shall make for better churches. This kind of prophetic work has been abundantly recognized in the realm of biblical study and in the field of religious education, where the student is here prepared to lead toward a better understanding of religion.

A new tendency in church idealism is making itself felt with astonishing rapidity. Protestantism has suddenly become conscious of the inartistic quality of many phases of its portrayal of religion. The ugliness of many church buildings, the all-too-prevalent lack of dignity in the conduct of worship, the dreadful quality of the music in many churches—these have all suddenly flashed upon our vision as impediments to profound religious experience. We are on the threshold of a strong desire to improve the aesthetic quality of Protestantism. Church architecture is reflecting changed standards in an admirable way. There is a very widespread desire for what is sometimes called an "enrichment of worship." We are beginning to have serious attention given to the quality of church music both in the matter of hymnbooks and in the matter of anthems. All these constitute hopeful signs.

But there is one aspect of the matter which deserves more attention than is

usually given to it. Medieval Catholicism worked out architectural forms and liturgical services of an astonishingly high degree of artistic quality. It is almost inevitable that in the craving for greater beauty men should turn instinctively to those great achievements of the past. In this new interest it is easy to forget that these forms of art were intended to convey the religious ideas of Catholicism. The Protestant reformers were vividly aware of this, and trenchantly eliminated what was objectionable. Those ancient forms are even less capable of suggesting modern Protestant ideals.

If, now, the work of those who are thinking purely of artistic quality in religion proceeds along the line of least resistance, we shall suddenly find churches so planned as almost to require a reproduction of something like the Catholic mode of worship. The laudable efforts to improve Protestant worship give ground for serious thought. In the endeavor to get away from showy and shallow anthems, choir masters are going to the beautiful and profound music of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and to the religiously impressive music of the Russian church. But the words employed in this music are for the most part expressions of adoration which have no definite meaning to the modern Protestant mind. Much the same is true of the rituals being adopted by Protestant churches. We may suddenly wake up to discover that in our effort to make religion emotionally appealing we have adopted forms capable of conveying a questionable kind of religious appeal. Emphasis may come to be laid on an other-worldly kind of religious aspiration, and the church may come to be an isolated region of religious meditation, largely unconnected with the great spiritual problems and movements of our own day.

It would seem that the time has come

when theological seminaries ought to face squarely this new problem. Ought there not to be developed a department which shall consider the whole realm of worship and aesthetics as seriously and as thoroughly as the problems of biblical criticism and of religious education are being considered? Instead of having a few music courses which are regarded in the nature of frills, there should be such an interpretation of music as can be given only by a scholar of the first rank in this field. The whole matter of symbolism in architecture and in worship should be in the hands of one who has a profound philosophy of aesthetics, together with an equally profound knowledge of the genius of modern Protestantism. There should be an output of scholarly articles and books on a par with those contributed by professors in the other departments.

It is only as the aesthetic side of Protestantism shall be taken as seriously as its intellectual and pedagogical aspects that we shall be able in the perplexing age before us to commend our faith with all the power and dignity which it deserves. If Protestantism is worth preserving it can be preserved only as it shall be made as obviously dignified and worthy as Catholicism. But this dignifying of Protestantism cannot be a mere imitation; it must develop its own original worship and its own original aesthetic forms in all the realms of religious art.

III. THE MINISTER OUR GENERATION NEEDS

By FRED EASTMAN

THE heart of this report lies in our recommendation that in our respective institutions we develop more adequately the creative, imaginative, and aesthetic life of our students, and that we endeavor to train them to render a similar service to the people of their future parishes.

The spiritual needs of the people determine the task of the church from generation to generation, and they determine, too, the nature of the training which the ministers of the church should have. With the changing life of the human race, sin takes new forms; new obstructions arise between men and God. New hells burn for those who lose him; visions of a new heaven and a new earth are caught by those who find him.

What are the peculiar spiritual needs of this generation? The increasing mechanization and institutionalism of human life have left the creative impulses in us unsatisfied. Men feel that they are more and more coming to be cogs in a great machine—a machine that is likely to grind them to powder in any moment of great strain. They want to be saved from this machine life. They want to be saved from the gods of standardization that are trying to make them all conform to type—to think and believe and act alike. The very preservation of sanity and emotional poise demands that the creative impulses and the thwarted emotions within them be trained and directed toward useful ends, instead of being allowed to burn themselves out in suppressed protest and rebellion.

It is a serious thing for any generation when its creative and aesthetic life is threatened with destruction by these forces of standardization and institutionalism. In the last analysis, the only enduring thing in any civilization is its art. Machines can build great skyscrapers, railroads, and subways, but the rains and wind of heaven will dissolve them. Stone and steel are not as lasting as poetry. The magnificent buildings of ancient Greece have crumbled, but the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are as vibrant with life as they were twenty-eight centuries ago. The glories of Solomon's Temple have all vanished—not one stone left upon an-

other; but the hymns of the Temple, and the visions of Isaiah, are with us yet. Long after the skyscrapers and the subways and the temples and the printing presses of 1928 have dissolved into their original elements, mankind will still be repeating "The Lord is my Shepherd" and "The quality of mercy is not strained." They will be baring their heads in reverence before Raphael's "Madonna"; they will be rising when the "Hallelujah Chorus" is sung. Machines perish; only art endures.

In America, during the past fifty years, we have been multiplying our machines and starving or crushing our artists. America today, with a population of 115,000,000, has not produced as many great artists as Athens with a population of 30,000. It is not simply a question of sustaining and encouraging the individuals who show artistic talent; the larger task is to foster and cherish the aesthetic life in all of us. For it is in our aspirations and our beauty and our courage that the artists find their songs. What a tremendous spiritual need this fact portrays! It is really a fundamental problem in salvation; for if salvation means anything in this day and age, it means saving the creative and the aesthetic and the imaginative in us from being crushed to death under our machines.

Such is the spiritual need which lies in the background of our thought as we present this report. What sort of ministry should we endeavor to develop to meet this need? The ministry which our generation needs is one that has the creative power of God to move upon the chaos of our spirits and bring order out of disorder, light out of darkness, and beauty out of ugliness. Putting it in Matthew Arnold's phrase, the minister we need is the one who can develop "the life of God in the soul of man." He must touch our imagi-

nations with a passion for the ideal. He must integrate our personalities and give them direction in the midst of all the disintegrating and conflicting currents of an increasingly industrial age. He must reach our emotions and resolve their discordant

jangling. He must feed our souls; he must lead us beside the still waters.

We believe that the courses proposed in music, drama, and art will lay the foundation for the development of such a type of ministry.

What Sort of Missionaries for China?

By PAUL REYNOLDS, '18

Missionary, Fenchow, Shansi, China

THE time is here when we must stop asserting our religion and let purposes, attitudes, and actions together with those greater values "which cannot be spoken" give their testimony. There is abroad in the mission world a challenge which seems to mean: "If your Christianity is as good as all your talking about it, be quiet and let us feel it, really know its potency."

While our gunboats patrol the Yangtze and our marines show half of Nicaragua what we want the other half to want; while no one has been able to forget that the bloodiest and most awful war of history was fought among the Christian nations; while one Eastern writer remarks that in seventy years the white races have annexed territories almost four times the size of Europe, and another admits that Japan is militaristic but adds, "You also note that it is the one country East of Suez not lying at the mercy of the whites"—it might be thoughtful for us to key down our voices a bit in the matter of asserting the universal validity, the uniqueness, and the finality of our interpretation of the Christian religion. Someone may ask why we are obstructing the way not only with gunboats and economic exploitation but in a measure with our very missionary method so that Christ stands again a stranger outside a closing door.

Since returning to America I have been trying to think how a Chinese student would feel in our various missionary gatherings. There seems to be a new and very heartening approach, a deepening desire for knowledge and understanding, a tendency through comparative religion to try to know how these others over there have been seeking God "if haply they might feel after Him and find Him." There is real humility as we think of our spiritual blindness, our terrible sins, but in every meeting after this promising beginning we always come out at the same place—"But, after all Christianity is the final religion, the unique, the universal. There are values in other religions but we cannot find one single item not found in Christianity." Grant for a moment that it all may be true, why keep reiterating it? Is it to "buck up our courage" as we see this field opened up by comparative religion getting bigger and bigger until in many places and in many lands it seems to stretch on and up to God? Is it to encourage the faithful here at home among whom we see signs of wavering? Whatever the causes today it is in very doubtful taste, and to some seems increasingly to be out of keeping with the deepest fundamentals of the Christlike attitude.

It may have been the only means in an age when Christianity was a small strug-

gling faith in danger of being persecuted out of existence and in greater danger of being swallowed up by assimilation with other faiths. Be that as it may, there is no such justification now when power, wealth, numbers, and, of greater import, recognized achievement, all are ours. Why not then return to that simple humbleness which shows out so clearly in the earlier records of the synoptics before the struggle for the existence of their faith had begun to blend with the tremendous experiences they were retelling, to color the accounts with stronger and stronger claims. Why not once more be satisfied with a simple "Come and see"?

May we mention a few things which desperately need changing if the spirit of Christ is to have free course in China.

The missionaries should be freed from military protection, from the use or threat of force. This can be done. It has been done in other cases in the past. The only thing needed is such a voice from the churches that the State Department may know exactly what we want. Moreover, as missionaries out there and as folks in the churches at home, we must bear with sympathetic patience reactions which may crop out for years to come, the result of decades of too close connection between gunboats and missionaries.

We need to help heal the divisions in the body of Christ. If this cannot be done here at home, we should at least put no obstacles in the way of their efforts and yearnings toward unity. It is no time to "point with pride" to the fact that much of the effort toward unity in the field comes from our missionaries, nor to belabor their differences. There is enough material for our sackcloth and ashes when we remember that there are one hundred and thirty different Christian organizations working in China and that we cannot trust each other's approach to God as being valid enough to warrant real

unity, much less the withdrawal of our particular "ism." China, in her hour of dire need, split into factions and groups, struggling to find unity, striving to find some principle by which that splendid family and small group loyalty of hers may be enlarged, faces this as one of her most fundamental problems, and Christianity stands a divisive force instead of a unifying power. Still worse, in their time of desperate hunger we are giving them the husks of an almost infinite variety of forms, ceremonies, creeds. The testimony of many of the most able and thoughtful Chinese Christian leaders is that the total impact of Christianity has left the impression of institutions, organization, efficiency, and such conflicting denominational divisions that a feeling of confusion has resulted, but no general, clear, deep impression of spiritual power.

How blindly and how blithely we set out to evangelize the world in our generation! Taking it for granted that all the light and right and civilization were with us, as well as the only really earnest and valid effort to help his own by the Father who yearns over all, we set out merrily to the tune of "From Greenland's Icy Mountains." Sometimes to stir pity so that money might come in to carry on our particular projects, we painted the picture of "heathendom" so black that their nationals, hearing, were outraged at the lack of fair proportion. Again, using Western conditions as an apologetic for Christianity, we spoke so glowingly of our civilization that Christian nationals coming to the West were bitterly disillusioned. Belatedly we are seeking and seeing values and beauties there. Humbled by the war and our eyes opened a little by the things others see as they look at us, we need earnestly to make confession. We need to ponder that vivid picture of the Pharisee and the Publican

until we can beat our breasts in remorse over our "superiority."

Not only was there this attempt to evangelize the world, instead of sharing in a search for God, but consider for a moment as another witness of our unconscious superiority all the trappings we lugged along. Organization, culture, methods, types of thought, creeds, church rituals, we naively took them along and passed them out as Christianity. If one wants a witness to the vitality of Christ's Way to God let him look at the load of Western stuff which Christianity is struggling under in China today. To get it clearly in view just forget your own denomination and look at the one hundred and twenty-nine other various ways to wash feet, be sprinkled, splashed, or dipped, recite this or that creed, and what-not, all essential to entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven. Or, if these things are not essential, why were they taken all the way to China, and why are they still insisted upon so strongly that when some poor missionary, unable to explain satisfactorily to his Chinese co-workers, seeks to emphasize more central things he faces thorough investigation from the Home Board and perhaps recall. Schools, churches, forms of worship, methods of bookkeeping, English in the schools—we labeled them all Christianity and passed them on to China until it was said the graduates could converse in polished English but did not know enough Chinese to write a letter home.

There are other phases of this problem which have not yet been fully seen, much less fairly and steadily faced. Take the matter of the scale and standard of living. Many missionaries are wrestling in agony with the fact that although living on a basis which at home would leave them among the "respectable poor," yet in China there is such a discrepancy between what seem to be their basic needs

and the scale of living possible for their Chinese co-workers that the bonds of real fellowship are often strained to the breaking-point. It has been the practice until this year in many parts of the field and in various phases of the work to place young recruits from home in charge of work, over the heads of nationals, often of splendid training, long experience, and great potential abilities. During the months ahead as we think over the various features of last spring's upheaval, these and other matters demand long hours of struggle in our most Christian thought and prayer.

May we unite with them in a joint quest. May we humbly confess that we have not brought Christ to them; that we never had him; that we never completely found him nor understood his way. Rather do we now wish to join with them in seeking God, the Father of all. This is not just a gesture. It is not merely a more effective approach in order to "put over our message" better. It is a vital sharing in a search for a more abundant life in the knowledge that we may find there is as much to learn as there is to share.

May we identify ourselves with them. Theirs is a terrific struggle for new life. May we cast in our lot with them as all phases of life are being remade. If we expect to sit in the manor-house and determine policies and disburse funds; nay, if we expect to go abroad to speak of heaven and salvation, while they are starving, struggling, yearning for food, safety, a chance to live, a chance to hope—well, there are several fates for us, and the easiest possible will be merely to be left high and dry when the streams of life flow elsewhere.

All this in answer to the question about the missionaries going back to China. Yes, we are wanted. Just how much may be judged by the fact that in spite of our

mistakes they ask us back. Are we needed? Mark this: Never before in history, perhaps never again, will the Christian church have such an opportunity. Four hundred million people are folding their tents and after thousands of years of static life are on the march. New political forms, new social customs, new economic means and modes, new religious life—or none! Never before in history have so many people in so short a span of time faced such momentous changes. God help us if in this their hour of need as they set out blindly, yearningly, searching for a new

and fuller life which as yet they see but dimly, we sit down to piddle about creeds and orders! Faced with the greatest opportunity of our history will the Christian church of the West give herself in loving service? Is she willing to sacrifice money, forms, creeds, types of organization, yes, even her interpretation of the gospel, that Christ may walk the Chinese Road? Does she remember, dare she remember with regard to herself that “except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die it beareth much fruit”?

The Spiritual Community

By FREDERICK BRINK

TODAY in religious effort there is a growing discontent with everything that has to do with theory, and an almost clamorous demand for practical activity. With all the obvious need for service, people are growing intolerant of any theory of service. Such a condition is to be understood but not accepted; for its very immediacy destroys the perspective necessary either to observe or to remedy the real problem. To act without theory is to build without plans or knowledge of materials. It is to mistake activity for effort; enthusiasm for wisdom. What is most needed today is a clear conception of what is to be achieved, and a theory of action which will reasonably assure that end. Practice has no importance apart from theory, and theory has no value apart from practice. One cannot be called primary and the other secondary; they are co-ordinate.

This is an attempt to conceive the task, and then to formulate a theory of

action by which the church can accomplish that task. To the probable disgust of those who first of all demand some practical activity, I shall begin by setting forth a theory of the church which I believe essential to social leavening. I shall use the term “the spiritual community” as best suggesting what we are seeking both to discover and to promote. The word “spiritual” suggests that whole realm of reality, unseen but eternal, with which religion is essentially concerned, not as an end in itself but as a source of inspiration and motive to effective living. At the same time, the word “community” does justice to that sense of fellowship which transcends individual wants and needs and gives a sense of comradeship in endeavor. Putting these two ideas together centralizes and makes concrete the thought at the heart of religion, and states the cause for which all organization exists and which all organization must serve.

The term “the spiritual community” is designed to suggest a working theory

for the church. It is definite enough to provide a solid basis of unity, yet fluid enough to admit the differences that religion has been all too prone to disregard or to force into conformity. It is based upon common spiritual needs, and a fellowship, not of creeds, but of endeavor. It escapes all the little loyalties that divide, not by ignoring them, but by substituting for them a far bigger loyalty.

Now, how does this term touch the denomination and the local community? What are its implications and its applications?

The unity of the spiritual community need not be sought in the elimination of denominational organization. Rather, it must be sought in that liberalizing and fraternizing which is possible only through some theory of co-operation that admits of a functional unity of dissimilar parts. To get this kind of unity, we must find something bigger and more fundamental for men to be loyal to than their respective denominations. But these bigger loyalties can quite properly function through denominational agencies.

As for the community, this is the place where the individual is conditioned in his attitudes and outlook, made magnanimous or petty in spirit, by the type of fellowship to which he contributes and in which he shares. It is here, if anywhere, that he must learn to love God with all his heart and his neighbor as himself. But to achieve these results, somehow he must be made to vision a spiritual community that includes God, his neighbor, and himself. A man's personal wisdom and experience count for little until he puts them into the service of some common cause. No Kingdom of Heaven is worth seeking that does not make room for Jew and Gentile, Greek and Barbarian, on a basis of fellowship that regards all men as brothers, and sons of a common Father.

What about the leadership of this spiritual community? Leadership carries temptations to power and compulsion. Prophetic vision and insight are in danger of being sacrificed to win a following or to force a result. But the very conception of a "spiritual" unity precludes the idea of compulsion; while the word "community" demands that results be mutually sought, not forcibly imposed. In a spiritual community, the priest must father his people, and the shepherd must feed his flock.

And what is to be the attitude of the church to other social institutions, and to businesses and professions? Our ideal is a free church in a free society; that is, a society in which there is freedom to belong, to contribute, to use. The church, in such a social order, will not take over the varied tasks of other institutions; nor will it serve as a moral policeman over them; but it will deal with the large aspects of fellowship, giving to society and to society's institutions both range and quality. At the same time, the church will provide a spiritual medium of understanding—a soil of common interest in which these other agencies may root themselves. The church will very rarely undertake administrative oversight of another agency. That is not the church's function. Rather, she can and will establish and encourage ethical standards; but always without compulsion. The task of the church is not so much to control as to interpret; not to administer, but to minister unto, business and politics and social agencies of every kind. In no way can she minister so faithfully and so effectively as in creating a fellowship that will find expression in necessary social institutions, and then trusting these institutions to do their work well by acting in full harmony with them. We shall have a free church in a free state; but the freedom of the church lies not apart from, but in the very heart of, the other free institutions

whose functions she is never to usurp, but to understand, encourage, and trust.

So the function of the church is to act as an interpreter of fellowship in a spiritual community. Insight and sympathy become far more important than authority. The will to understand becomes the

power to save. Once more, the message of the church becomes "good news," and organization gives way to a "community of believers." This is the New Jerusalem that first came down from God, but now grows up from the hearts of men; a fellowship of love in common service.

What the Students Are Doing

POETS, PLAYWRIGHTS, AND ACTORS

Four hundred years ago puritanism officially chased art out of religion. Today the church is calling art back, and The Chicago Theological Seminary seems to have taken the lead in welcoming the lost son home. Hilton Chapel by itself is a whole education in art. Add to all the courses and books and talk on religious art, literature, drama, and music, and you have a fit setting for the coming of the religious artists of the future.

When they shall come no one knows; yet, *en attendant*, there is growing up a new generation of poets in the Seminary producing work ranging from austere classical odes to wild free-verse in the true Chicago style. We may note six bona fide student poets: Herman Johnson, Ferry Platt, Alan Jenkins, John Davis, Ted Lilley, and Ellis Cowling, and a host of other amateurs. Indeed, the poetic impulse is so strong as to have contaminated members of the Faculty, producing that memorable phrase, "Neo-Platonism was the last flower in the bouquet of ancient philosophy."

But poetry is only half the story. With the advent of our new professor of religious drama last year, dramatics have received a great push. Irene Taylor, alias Mrs. Everett MacNair, wrote a play under the direction of Professor Eastman, *The Color Line*, which has since become famous. It was presented with great success last year, and attracted the attention of the management of the Student Volunteer Convention at Detroit, who asked to have the play given there. Under the direction of Mr. and Mrs. MacNair the play was presented there this winter, and has been repeated since for other groups in Chicago. The

play has been published, and is to be performed by various colleges in the country.

Seminary men are also distinguishing themselves as actors. They hold the chief parts in *The Color Line*, and *Sham*, the interdivinity play to be given this winter. Both plays make vehicles for the unique personality of Herman Johnson, a son of a Kansas farmer, and a graduate of a small college in the state, who came to the Seminary to clean up every available prize and scholarship. He was one of the first Seminary students to take the clinical course at Worcester State Hospital under Mr. Boisen. He writes poetry as unconventional as his views on religion.

SOCIALS—FORMAL AND INFORMAL

Gossip is sponsored by the various social functions: a Thanksgiving Party, with the appearance of the Glee Club and with Mr. Edwards' unique readings; a Thanksgiving Service, featuring Dr. Davis' famous fish-story; a Christmas Party, with the presentation of the MacNair family play (about which more later); and two Congregational Club parties, which (as usual) were dazzling successes. The Wednesday afternoon teas have continued as popular as ever.

The last few months have witnessed the rise of a new center of informal social activity, the Library. Indeed, the liveliness of conversation, the geniality and spontaneity of the exchange of thoughts and sentiments that go on daily over the neglected books, might be another worthy proof of the triumph of modern education in humanizing study. More exclusive society events of the Seminary must also be mentioned, such as private bull-fests and birthday parties, chief of which was a certain

celebration in Richard Murray's room from 12:00 P.M. to 1:30 A.M., with refreshments of fried chicken, ginger ale, and soda-crackers, a musical program of two violins, three mouth-organs, and full male chorus.

EARNING THE DAILY BREAD

Eighty-eight per cent of the student body are working their way through school in whole or in part. Church positions are the most popular form of employment. Twenty-two students hold full pastorates, evenly divided between country and city churches. Twenty-three are employed as assistant pastors. Five work in settlement houses, six are employed in Dr. Holt's famous survey, and six work in the Library and in the Seminary Office. The remaining eighteen have invaded the University Commons, the Ida Noyes Cafeteria, and nearby tearooms, proving Dr. Ames's theory of the close connection existing between food and religion. The unemployed class consists of only four students. The remaining six who have no outside work are scholarship students, and (much against their own wishes) are required to devote their full time to their school work.

RELIGION

Gossip, socials, art, even work, all are parts of the seminary life. Yet religion remains the supreme interest. Worship is carried on in the daily services at Bond Chapel, the weekly vesper services at Hilton Chapel, and the newly instituted musicales for private meditation and prayer. The fellowship meetings

have been marked by sessions of unusual interest. Dr. Hill, of Worcester State Hospital, spoke of the opportunity for clinical work for Seminary students; his talk produced such an impression that for weeks people were talking of suppressed conflicts, complexes, and psychoses. Dr. Fitch provoked a great deal of thought and discussion by his sarcastic remarks on the fallacies of humanism and "sentimental liberalism." A stormy discussion on the "Private Life of the Minister" followed a talk by Mr. Swihard, a student speaker from Maywood Seminary. Finally, a delightful variation to the regular procedure was afforded by a meeting on Mr. Cashman's birthday, in which he spoke of his trip to Europe, and refreshed those present with coffee and doughnuts.

Yet it may be that the most profound religious life of the Seminary is not to be sought in these public meetings. Religion is something that every man must seek and find for himself, and hammer out in the loneliness of his own life. These inner struggles are sacred. People do not go around talking about them. Yet signs of this solitary search for God are evident. All around there is a ferment and a suppressed excitement in matters religious. If there is one thing lacking it is complacency and taking religion for granted. Doubts and questionings there are a-plenty. Yet withal there seems to be an intense longing for truth and enlightenment, and a dogged determination not to be satisfied with words and hearsay, but to achieve a hard-won faith that shall bear the authority of first-hand discovery.

—GREGORY VLASTOS

Alumni Notes

I. IN MEMORIAM

1867. Rev. Harmon Bross was born in Montezuma, New York, in 1835. His college work was done at Hillsdale, Michigan. Following service in the Civil War he came to the Seminary where he took the regular course. After graduation he had pastorates in Iowa, Nebraska, and Wyoming. For sixteen years he was superintendent of the Congre-

gational Home Missionary Society in Nebraska. Mr. and Mrs. Bross were present at the meeting of the National Council in Omaha and were introduced by the Moderator, where Dr. Bross made a short speech.

A letter from his daughter, Mrs. A. F. Newell, whose husband was graduated from the Seminary in 1893, tells of Dr. Bross's death on January 8, and adds, "As long as I

can remember he has always spoken with the greatest affection of our beloved Seminary and no one has rejoiced more in its growth and prosperity."

1870. Rev. Stanley E. Lathrop died in Madison, Wisconsin, December 26. Like Dr. Bross he was a veteran of the Civil War. He graduated from Beloit in 1867. Fourteen years of his pastorate were spent as a missionary under the American Missionary Association in the South. The rest of his ministry was spent in Wisconsin where he held pastorates at New London, Washburn, and Ashland. During his life he did much work among home-missionary churches and in logging camps. He was active in spreading libraries among the sparsely settled regions.

1896. Rev. Jonas G. Brooks was born in 1866 on an Illinois farm. He graduated from Wheaton College in 1893 and came at once to the Seminary. His ministry was spent in his native state where he had pastorates in Wheaton, Payson, and other places. He was also for several years pastor-at-large of the Congregational churches in Illinois. He died December 8, 1927.

Dr. Brooks was a generous, conscientious minister of the gospel, warm hearted, evangelistic, and sacrificing in every particular.

1896. Rev. Karl F. Henrikson was born in Finland in 1863 and came to America at the age of twenty. He was ordained in 1893 and became the first pastor of the Finnish Congregational Church of Quincy, Massachusetts, where he served ten years.

Mr. Henrikson established a Finnish Training School for the ministry which was later transferred to the Chicago Seminary. He was also superintendent of Finnish work under the Congregational Home Missionary Society.

During the latter part of his life his home was in Quincy, Massachusetts, where he died on November 22, 1927. The funeral service was conducted by Rev. V. V. Sundelin, Dr. F. E. Emrich of the Massachusetts Home Missionary Society, and by pastors of the other Finnish churches.

1899. Rev. David J. Perrin, D.D., died at his home at Huron, South Dakota, on February 14, of cerebral hemorrhage. Dr. Perrin

was born in England; he graduated from Yankton College in 1895, and came to the Seminary from Armour, South Dakota. During the latter half of his ministry Dr. Perrin served as an executive of the South Dakota Congregational Conference, first as an associate of Dr. Thrall, and since 1920 as the state superintendent. As a member of the State Superintendents' Council of the Seminary Dr. Perrin was in constant touch with its work. His great service was in the state which had been his home for many years and where he was the steadying friend and counsellor of his brother-ministers.

II. FROM MISSION FIELDS

1881. President Caleb Frank Gates of Robert College, Constantinople, is in this country this fall in the interest of the Near East colleges. He spent part of the week beginning with December 11 at the Seminary. During this time he spoke at the international meeting on Sunday evening, at chapel on Wednesday noon, and in the fellowship meeting on Thursday evening. Dr. Gates has been one of the influential men in the troublous times in the Near East for forty years, both in diplomatic circles and at the time of local outbreaks. As president of three different colleges he has exerted a large educational influence.

1887. President George E. White of Anatolia College, Salonica, Greece, visited the Seminary in October. Dr. White is undertaking a new enterprise in the transfer of the college from Marsovan to Greece. Dr. Albert Shaw of the *Review of Reviews* characterizes the work as follows:

Of all the colleges established by American beneficence in the Mediterranean regions, Anatolia College has the most auspicious location; and looking to the longer future it gives promise of an almost unbounded usefulness. Enjoying the thorough confidence and good will of the Greek authorities, both civil and religious, this young institution under the experienced leadership of its president, Dr. George E. White, is serving present educational needs, while also for various reasons it is best fitted to train pupils of several races besides the Greeks. Already it is giving instruction to many picked young students who have been maturing under the care of the orphanages founded by the Near East

Relief, and who are being trained for service among their people.

1889. Rev. Charles N. Ransom has retired from his work at Mapamulo, South Africa, and now lives at Auburndale, Massachusetts. For a long while Mr. Ransom was considered the missionary of the Seminary, and the Faculty and students shared in his salary.

1919. Saishi Shiu is the principal of the Christian Girls' School at Mayebashi, Japan, which was founded forty years ago.

1920. Kyoji Tominomori is professor of New Testament in the Theological Department of Doshisha University, at Kyoto, Japan. In addition to this he preaches three Sundays of the month in Osaka. He also preaches in Kyoto. He is writing the life of Jesus and a commentary on the Gospel of Mark, contributing to two Japanese magazines.

1920. Rev. Harold S. Matthews is the American representative in the Porter Middle School of Techow, Shantung, China, of which Wang Yuan-Hqin, who studied in the Seminary during two quarters of 1927, is principal. Mr. Matthews writes that the School is now registered with the Government Department of Education, and he expresses the hope that as a result the people of China will increasingly think of the School as their own and not as a foreign school. The enrolment is two hundred students, two-thirds of the normal enrolment. The heavy continual demands made by the militarists on the Shantung farmers and the exceptionally poor crops (practically no crop in some nearby districts due to this year's drought), together with the frequent bandit raids, have been too much, and scores of boys who would otherwise be in the school have been forced to stay out this year.

1922. A. Willard Jones, who received his Master's degree in the summer of 1922, has been at the Friends' Palestine Mission, Ram Allah, Palestine, for the past six years. A recent letter indicates some change in his work. The United Missionary Council has asked him to assist in exploring the social, industrial, and rural conditions in Palestine. The following quotations give a picture of his task:

The economic problem is of fundamental importance for Missions. It is remarkable how well

the villagers do under the circumstances. Men, women and children work early and late. They do not want nor need ordinary charity. They need a chance to earn a living. One wishes for an Aladdin's lamp or a bank balance in order to establish local industries.

Life in Palestine is sometimes difficult but never tiresome. It is inspiring to see the improvements which are taking place, it is disturbing to see the substitution of western customs and a decline in religious interest, but it is a challenge to try to present vital Christianity to those who are tired of old forms and meaningless mumblings.

1922. Rev. Richard Keithahn is one of the China-in-India-Band in whose organization Professor Walker was a leading factor. Dr. Keithahn's first work was among the villages of India, but in September last it was found necessary to transfer him to Pasumalai, three miles out from Madura, where he is acting principal of the high school of 450 boys. Of Pasumalai he writes as follows:

Pasumalai [Cow Hill] is 3 miles from the great city, Madura. It is the educational center of our American Madura Mission. Here we find the Theological Seminary where our pastors are trained, the Training School for Teachers, the Trade School where carpenters, blacksmiths, printers, electricians, motor car drivers and repairers are trained, and, not least of all, the high school where I have said almost half of the thousand students of Pasumalai are accounted for. There are opportunities here that thrill any educationalist or evangelist. As I am something of both, I am doubly thrilled. And tho we are in the throes of a Government system that prepares for anything but life, yet I do see hope and opportunity for the best piece of Christian work in India right here in Pasumalai. I hope there may be such leadership that may make this a fact.

1922. Clifford Manshardt who is the director of the Nagpada Neighbourhood House in Bombay has the following interesting statement in regard to his work:

Our work is moving along in very good fashion. We are in one of the worst slum areas in the world, and are dealing with a problem further complicated by the presence of so many varying language and religious groups. Every day we have in the building people speaking 6 to 8 languages, and from the Hindu, Muslim, Jewish, and Christian faiths. We are doing a good piece

of inter-religious co-operation. . . . My working day is a long one, but it is at the same time a mighty interesting one. In the course of a week here we deal with practically every phase of the human problem, and generally in its most primitive form.

1926. Rev. Paul E. Nilson spent the year 1925 and 1926 at the Seminary taking his Master's degree from the University. He returned to Turkey in the fall of 1926 to become the director of the American School for Boys in Talas, Turkey. Pending diplomatic adjustments, Mr. Nilson did varied missionary work in Turkey. Some of the time has been spent in Tarsus College where he worked ten years. He is now established in his home at Talas where his permanent work is to be located.

III. FROM OTHER FIELDS

1883. Rev. Victor F. Clark, who has spent a third of a century in churches in Nebraska, became pastor of the Congregational Church in Lebanon, Missouri, last April. He writes, "Just went over my seventy-first hurdle and still going strong. Have organized smaller boys into a Friendly Indian Club; older boys now in Boy Scouts and girls in Campfire."

1886. Rev. Otterbein Oscar Smith is minister of the First Congregational Church in Pueblo, Colorado. During the four years and a half of his pastorate the membership has been increased from 220 to 425. The church building has been improved at a cost of twelve thousand dollars, and the church now has one of the most artistic buildings in the city, and one of the most usable. Mr. Smith is taking an important place in the civic work of his community.

1891. Rev. Samuel M. Hilliard is now living in Highmore, South Dakota. As a student in the Seminary he began a Sunday-school and preaching service on Grand Avenue, founding the Grand Avenue Congregational Church of Chicago, in the center of a square mile unoccupied by any other religious organization. This is one of the important churches in Chicago at the present time.

1892. Rev. David Ellis Evans writes from Red Lodge, Montana, as follows: "We need young ministers in Montana. I would like very much to put one in my place here."

1894. Rev. R. K. Stetson concluded a pastorate of nine years in Grandville, Illinois, to enter war work. Following this, he was the secretary of the Y.M.C.A. in Two Harbors, Michigan. His temporary address is Grandville, Illinois.

1896. Rev. George B. Spangler is principal of the Junior High School in Hartshorne, Oklahoma, where his influence for good is felt.

1898. Rev. H. Edward Mills is now serving his third year as pastor of the Church of Truth, an independent congregation, affiliated with the International New Thought Alliance. He writes: "My tasks and problems are the same in many ways as were those which confronted me in my definite Congregational pastorates with this possible exception: My people expect me to make for them and with them a very definite and sometimes almost dramatic demonstration of the dynamic content of Christian dogma."

1899. Rev. James Mullenbach has been for fifteen years chairman of the Trade Board under the Hart Schaffner and Marx and Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America Labor Agreement. On November 11 a dinner was given in his honor at the Palmer House, which was attended by over seven hundred representatives of the interests represented. Dr. Mullenbach's work represents one of the most advanced features of co-operation within the field of industry for adjusting differences. The meeting itself showed the fine good will that existed between the corporation and its employees. Much of the success for all that has been realized is due to Dr. Mullenbach.

1901. Rev. A. Craig Bowdish is pastor of the Independent Union Church of Holy Hill, Florida, which is attempting to weld together three civilizations with wide ranges of religious outlook.

1902. Rev. Charles Swanson has divided his time since he graduated from the Seminary between the West and the Northeast. At present he is pastor of the Swedish Congregational Church at Proctor, Vermont.

1903. Rev. Walter Howard Moore, who served the Washington Park Congregational Church in Chicago for twelve years, is now the pastor of the Congregational Church at East Chicago, Indiana. This church is in a section

of the Calumet district, one of the greatest industrial centers in the country.

1904. Rev. Howard A. Morton has been the pastor for the last seven years of the Phillips Congregational Church of South Boston, Massachusetts. This is a down-town church with a constantly changing congregation.

1913. Chester S. Bucher now lives in Scarsdale, New York, where he is employed by the General Electric Company.

1914. Rev. Alfred D. Grey is pastor of the Plymouth Congregational Church, Lawrence, Kansas. The fact that the University of Kansas is there presents a tremendous challenge, with its over four thousand students. The church itself has an interesting history in that it was the parish for over forty years of the Rev. Richard Cordley, a member of the Kansas Band which went to that state in the fifties, in the days of the Free Soil Agitation and the Quantrell Raid.

1915. Rev. A. H. Leaman is now teacher of evangelism at the Moody Bible Institute. He also spends some time in the evangelistic field.

1918. Rev. Gustave Bloom has been preaching in Sweden since 1921. The first pastorate of over four years was at Rattvik. Last autumn he accepted the call to a Swedish Congregational Church at Mora, Sweden. He writes of his work as follows: "This is one of the most historical places of old Sweden. The work is both city and rural. We have a main auditorium in the town and several smaller groups and chapels in the surrounding rural district. If any of the alumni of the Chicago Theological Seminary ever happen to visit Sweden, don't forget to call on me."

1919. Rev. John F. C. Green is now pastor of the German Evangelical Protestant Church at McKeesport, Pennsylvania. This is one of that group of German churches in Pennsylvania which has recently become affiliated with the Congregational denomination.

1924. Rev. Ray Caldwell is pastor of the Pilgrim Congregational Church at Lansing, Michigan. One of the features of his work has been the development of three dramatic classes by which the children and young peo-

ple are receiving training in drama and pageantry, are learning biblical and modern history, and are developing church life which is full of interest and of character growth.

1924. Rev. Paul W. Somers was in the Seminary for one year. Since that time he has been in Boys' Executive Work in the Y.M.C.A. at Des Moines, Iowa, and for the last five years in Pasadena, California.

1925. Rev. Robert Watson who has been pastor of the Congregational church at Princeton for the last four years has been called to the church at Lombard, Illinois.

1925. Rev. Edward W. Saylor is now teaching in Talladega College, Talladega, Alabama.

1925. Rev. Frank P. Frazier is known throughout the country as "Phil." Mr. Frazier is a Sioux Indian who graduated from Oberlin College and from Chicago Theological Seminary. He is widely known throughout our Congregational circles. Mr. and Mrs. Frazier are now carrying on work in connection with the Mission in McLoud, Oklahoma. He writes as follows concerning his work: "My missionary field is an oblong of 28 by 6 miles. I have three hundred Indians in this district. I have been holding open-air meetings among trees and in their camps."

1926. Rev. Robert Hoerner is pastor of the Congregational Church at Preston, Iowa. Mr. Hoerner grew up in the First Congregational Church of Dubuque, Iowa, which recently honored him by a banquet where he spoke upon the experiences of a young minister.

1927. Rev. John E. Hester is teaching in the field of sociology and the social work in Talladega. This is a Negro college founded by the American Missionary Association in 1867. The college department numbers 240. Mr. Hester writes: "There are a good many students of quality. They have ideals and solid character. Horace Greeley said, 'Young man, go west.' O. L. Keener, now in Berea College, wrote me five years ago, 'It is now time to say young man, go south.' Those are my sentiments."

1927. Rev. Howard R. Towne is the stated supply of The First Congregational Church of Traverse City, Michigan, during the leave of absence of Rev. Demas Cochlin.

—FRANK G. WARD

Faculty Recommendations of Books

RELIGIOUS THINKING IN THE LAST QUARTER CENTURY

Ed. by Gerald Birney Smith. University of Chicago Press, 1927. \$3.00.

The Divinity School, with whom our Faculty has such happy and profitable associations, has published a masterly survey of recent shifts in emphasis in the various fields of theological scholarship, shifts which our colleagues across the way have themselves had no small share in effecting. Dr. Smith is editor of this volume. Dr. William Adams Brown, Professor E. L. Schaub of Northwestern, and President Davis are among the contributors.

A. C. MCGIFFERT, JR.

CURRENT CHRISTIAN THINKING

By Gerald Birney Smith. University of Chicago Press, 1928. \$2.00.

Augustine once said, "Unhappy is the man who is always seeking but never finding." Roman Catholicism and much current Protestantism is founded on the deep-seated need of security and finality. The keynote of the tough-minded modernist is inquiry. He is intellectually adventuresome. "There is a thrill which accompanies the discovery of truth which seems very precious to the modernist in contrast with the somewhat tame security due to the repetition of authoritative or conventionally approved truth." Dr. Smith admirably presents the background and the position of both these types of current Christian thinking.

He also raises a number of pertinent questions. Professor Eugene Lyman has reminded the systematic theologian that one of his tasks is prophetically to point the direction in which religious thinking is moving or should move. The questions Dr. Smith so clearly and incisively asks are bound to demand increasing attention. What are the implications of an appeal to Christian experience? Is an emotional appeal to Christ as the supreme and sole authority a valid and permanent means of clarifying the problems of theological thinking? Can Jesus' contribution today be more than that of a stimulus to noble life and profound thought? How correct is the depress-

ing view of the cosmic process as largely indifferent to human ideals? May we continue to believe in cosmic support of our ideals and values? In what sense does God "care"? May we admit that traditional definitions of God are too precise, too adequate, without losing that majestic mysticism which "seeks to lift human life higher by enabling men to worship and to trust the power that is carrying forward the age-long process"? *Le Dieu défini est le Dieu fini*. Can the doctrines of liberal Christianity sustain a humble and prayerful relation to God, a vital consecration to Jesus, a growing sense of unity with the creative presence of the Divine Spirit within us, and a glad devotion to the Kingdom of God," to the avoidance of religious barrenness? These are some of the questions raised and answered by a clear-sighted theologian to whom evangelical Christianity is not a mode of thought but a precious personal experience of salvation.

This book is one of a convenient series of handbooks intended to set forth the results of the scientific study of religion and ethics. Among the other volumes in the series are *The Life of Paul*, by Professor Robinson, and *Principles of Preaching*, by President Davis.

A. C. MCGIFFERT, JR.

CHRISTIANITY, PAST AND PRESENT

By Charles Guignebert, Macmillan, 1927. 507 pp. \$4.50.

The title of this book is a misnomer, for Professor Guignebert (of the University of Paris) confines his attention to the Roman Catholic church. He barely mentions Protestantism.

Religion, he says, unfolds itself according to laws similar to those which dominate the life and existence of organic beings. It remains vital only as long as it adjusts itself to the circumstances and necessities of the changing day. If it does not adapt itself, it is doomed to death. With this thesis as a basis, he unfolds the history of Catholicism. Roman Catholicism imposed itself upon the Oriental features of Christianity by developing a firm doctrinal tradition and a political and hierarchical authority in the papacy. Refusing to adjust itself to any of the movements of the Western

scientific spirit, it has become a church of immovable tradition and of conservative authority. It will hardly survive, because it lacks response to the constant demands of the modern age for free inquiry into the problems of life. It will die. Protestantism as the first successful opposition to Catholic institutionalism has laid the foundation of the religion of the future, which will be undogmatic and personal. "The time has come," says Guignebert, "when everyone carves out for himself under the label of Christianity a religion made to his own measure and to suit his personal needs."

The signs of our times do not seem to show Catholicism at the end of its career. Moreover, strong doubts arise against the validity of Guignebert's theory. One cannot view the history of Christianity only under biological aspects. Guignebert overemphasizes the influence of the environment upon the Christian religion. Equally able scholars hold that Christianity owes its character as a religion of salvation not to an adaptation to the religious yearnings of the people of the ancient Graeco-Roman world, but to the personal experiences and to the activities of Jesus and of Paul. They have inspired Christianity in all its periods. The history of Christianity, Roman Catholicism included, is the history of a constant struggle of personal religion against institutionalism. Guignebert prophesies the defeat of institutionalism, but not of personal religion.

WILHELM PAUCK

NEW SOLUTIONS OF NEW TESTAMENT
PROBLEMS

By Dr. Edgar J. Goodspeed. University of Chicago Press, 1927. \$2.00.

In this little book, Professor Goodspeed has made a welcome contribution to our knowledge of the historical relationships between the various parts of the New Testament. Of particular interest is his explanation of the collecting of the letters of Paul. It is clear that these letters were not generally known at the time of the writing of the Book of Acts. What is more natural, than the conclusion presented by Professor Goodspeed that the publication of the Book of Acts led to interest

in Paul's letters and to the first collecting of them?

BENJAMIN W. ROBINSON

THE MAKING OF LUKE-ACTS

By Henry J. Cadbury. Macmillan, 1927. \$3.00.

This is a clear, up-to-date presentation of scholarly information and opinions regarding the two-volume work, Luke-Acts. One of the hypotheses defended is that of the "Proto-Luke," an earlier Lukan gospel underlying the present one.

BENJAMIN W. ROBINSON

THE PLASTIC AGE OF THE GOSPEL

By Andrew C. Zenos. Macmillan, 1927. \$2.75.

Professor Zenos has arranged the facts of New Testament history with unusual power. The message of Jesus is brought out in its relation to the ministry of John the Baptist, on the one side, and to the subsequent teachings of Paul and John, on the other.

BENJAMIN W. ROBINSON

A MANUAL GRAMMAR OF THE GREEK
NEW TESTAMENT

By H. E. Dana and J. R. Mantey. Macmillan, 1927. \$4.00.

This is a good textbook for beginners in New Testament Greek. It gives full recognition to the relation of New Testament Greek to the popular Greek of the papyri.

BENJAMIN W. ROBINSON

CHRISTIAN VOICES AROUND THE WORLD

This is the general title of a series of six books published by the Missionary Education Movement and for the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions. The volumes, each with its catchy title such as *Japan Speaks for Itself*, deal with the Near East, China, Japan, India, Africa, and Latin America. While Milton Stauffer is the assembler and editor of the series, the chapters in each book are furnished by a group of Nationals who interpret the Christian movement within their own civilization. Here are messages from indigenous Christian leaders around

the world. The chapter headings are standardized throughout the series; the first chapter in each book is "Our Cultural Heritage," the last chapter, "Youth's Challenge to Youth." The intervening chapters cover such topics as the changing life and thought, the native religion, and the give and take with Christianity.

Altogether, these thirty-nine chapters from fifty-eight authors give us a glimpse into Christianity and world-fellowship through new eyes, with new criticisms, and withal new hope.

FRANK G. WARD

THE MISSIONARY EDUCATION OF BEGINNERS

By Jessie Eleanor Moore.

This is another book published by the Missionary Education Movement. It is just what the title indicates, as it seeks to carry the spirit of service and good will back to the unconscious beginnings and to give it character by Christianizing all social contacts.

FRANK G. WARD

THE RUSSIAN LAND

By Albert Rhys Williams. New Republic, Inc., 1927. 294 pp. \$1.00.

Mr. Williams, who spent a number of years in Russia living with the people and studying the conditions under which they live, collected in this volume a number of his delightful sketches of Russian life, some of which appeared previously in various magazines. These readable, vivid accounts, replete with genuine insight and sympathetic understanding of the subjects treated, permit the reader to form a concrete conception of the everyday life of the various classes of the Russian people. The author has no theory to expound, no thesis to

prove; he observes human life under the new conditions imposed upon Russia by the soviet government and portrays it not only faithfully, but with the simplicity of consummate literary art. The religious conditions are treated in the same concrete fashion, by means of stories from real life, in the chapters on "Vlas, the Old Believer," "In the Village of Salvation," and on "Abbess, Archeologist and Agitator." These chapters present no systematic account of the soviet religious legislation, but are sketches drawn from life of religious personalities molded by the new environment or struggling against it. A collection of delightful tales of the life of the new Russia!

MATTHEW SPINKA

THE LIFE OF PAUL

By Benjamin W. Robinson. University of Chicago Press. 268 pp. \$2.00.

There is no secret about the popularity of Dr. Robinson's *Life of Paul*; the scholarship, sincerity, and frank simplicity of the book commend it to any open-minded reader, while the character of the author makes his works doubly meaningful to those who have studied or worked with him. Here is his new edition; larger, fuller, more complete. Those who enjoyed and appreciated the first edition will be happier than ever with this one. Dr. Robinson has amplified his bibliography and brought it up to date; has included new elements of scholarly knowledge about the life of Paul's world and time; and, best of all, has added a section dealing with Paul's religion. Those who have lost the man Paul in his letters can find him again, alive and real and vigorous, in this volume.

FRED EASTMAN